REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-13 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, and 13 have been amended, and new claim 14 has been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-14 are pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by European Patent Application No. 1 089 168, issued to Miyake et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Miyake"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of this claim.

Claim 13 of the present application has been amended to depend from claim 1, which is discussed below, and which is not rejected under Miyake. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's §102 rejection of claim 13 based on Miyake.

In item 6 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by the Description of the Related Art (hereinafter referred to as "DRA"), which the Examiner alleged to be an admission of prior art. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites a method for instruction processing executing on a computer including assigning, to a physical instruction slot, said basic instruction determined to be assignable to said logical instruction slot by increasing a logical instruction slot pointer based on a relation between said basic instruction determined to be assignable and another basic instruction assigned to a corresponding logical instruction slot. Support for the amendment of claim 1 can be found in the present application at least on page 30, lines 3-4, as well as operation S73 in Figures 22 and 28-30. The Applicants respectfully submit that DRA does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that DRA discloses assigning a basic instruction to an instruction slot when determined to be assignable to said logical instruction slot. To wit, the Examiner cited pate 8, lines 20-35 of DRA as disclosing this assignment. However, the Applicants respectfully submit that DRA does not disclose or suggest determining the basic instruction to be assignable to the logical instruction slot by increasing a logical instruction slot pointer based on the relation

between the basic instruction determined to be assignable and another basic instruction assigned to a corresponding logical instruction slot.

Therefore, DRA does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, DRA does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since DRA does not disclose the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over DRA, and withdrawal of the §102(a) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by DRA. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-8 also patentably distinguish over DRA.

Claim 9 of the present application, as amended, recites similar features to those discussed in regard to claim 1. Further, claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by DRA. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9-12 also patentably distinguish over DRA.

New Claim 14

New claim 14 depends from claim 1, which is shown above as being patentably distinguishable over DRA, and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by DRA. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 14 also patentably distinguishes over DRA.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 9, and 13 have been amended, and new claim 14 has been added. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is

requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 13, 2008   By: _____

Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 5ß,908

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501